



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/844,716	04/25/2001	Carol S. Gruchala	8285/430	1846

757 7590 04/23/2002
BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, IL 60610

EXAMINER

BUI, BING Q

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2642

DATE MAILED: 04/23/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

NM

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/844,716	Applicant(s) Grachula et al
	Examiner Bing Bui	Art Unit 2642

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on Apr 25, 2001
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 27-59 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 27-59 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

a) All b) Some* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 14) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 15) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 18) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 16) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 19) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 17) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 5 20) Other: _____

Art Unit: 2642

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103© and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

2. Claims 27-35, 38-49, 50-55 and 58-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fleischer, III et al (US Pat No 5,974,133) in view of London (US Pat No. 5,590,184), and further in view of Staples et al (US Pat No. 5,889,845) that have been cited by Applicant.

Art Unit: 2642

Regarding claim 27, Fleischer, III et al teach the invention substantially as claimed, a method of providing a work-at-home telecommunication service, comprising:

(a) receiving a dialed number from a calling party, said calling party being associated with a calling party identification number (col 5, ln 58-col 6, ln 7 and col 46, ln 58-col 47, ln 43);

Fleischer, III et al differ from claimed invention in that it does not teach:

(b) automatically modifying the calling party identification number to an identification number of a group associated with the calling party.

However, London teaches:

automatically modifying the calling party identification number to a randomly selected number (an identification number of a group) associated with the calling party (Figs 1 and 6; col 1, ln 61-col 2, ln 25 and col 4, ln 51-col 5, ln 15); and

Staples et al teach a system and method in which a remote corporate telecommuter such as a work-at-home agent can make business out-going calls, send faxes, transmit data, send e-mail or perform Internet access as if he were physically present right at corporate office (Abstract), and as an inherent result, any information or data related to a call received at the destination terminal display unit, wherever caller-ID feature is available, should include the corporate information such as corporate ANI or identification.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the system and method of modifying a caller number to another number such as a corporate number as taught by combination of London and Staples et al

Art Unit: 2642

into view of Fleischer, III et al such that calls made to called parties on behalf of the group or corporation will be identified as originating from the group or corporation instead of the individual placing the call from his home.

Regarding claim 28, Fleischer, III et al teach the invention substantially as claimed, the step of receiving a service specific code from the calling party (col 46, ln 58-col 47, ln 15).

Regarding claim 29, Fleischer, III et al teach the invention substantially as claimed, the step of receiving a vertical service code from the calling party (col 46, ln 58-col 47, ln 43).

Regarding claim 30, Fleischer, III et al teach the invention substantially as claimed, the step of receiving an access code from the calling party (col 46, ln 58-col 47, ln 43).

Regarding claim 31, Fleischer, III et al teach the invention substantially as claimed, the step of receiving a personal identification number from the calling party (col 46, ln 58-col 47, ln 43).

Regarding claim 32, Fleischer, III et al teach the invention substantially as claimed, the step of sending a query to a service control point, the query comprising the calling party identification number (col 47, ln 5-15).

Claims 33, 40-42 and 52-54 are rejected for the same reasons as recited in the rejection of claim 27.

Regarding claims 34 and 50, Fleischer, III et al teach the invention substantially as claimed, with the exception of providing the step of sending the modified calling party identification number to a called party associated with the dialed number.

Art Unit: 2642

However, London teaches a caller-id display unit at called party terminal displayed the number modified from caller identification number by privacy communication service system (Abstract and col 3, ln 8-42).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to integrate the Caller-ID service as taught by London into work-at-home system of Fleischer, III et al in order to provide called party the option of whether or not receiving the call based on the nature of information received.

Regarding claims 35 and 51, Fleischer, III et al teach the invention substantially as claimed, with the exception of providing the step of sending the modified calling party identification number to a called party associated with the dialed number in response to a failure of receiving a privacy access code from the calling party .

However, London teaches when a caller is unable to access the privacy communication service system, the call is completed in conventional manner, this means real caller identification number will be sent and displayed at the called party terminal if called terminal has caller-id display unit.(Fig 6 items 603 and 613).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to add the step of sending calling party identification number to a called party associated with the dialed number in response to a failure of receiving a privacy access code from the calling party as taught by London to the work-at-home network of Fleischer, III et al to achieve Applicant's claimed limitations.

Art Unit: 2642

Regarding claim 38, Fleischer, III et al teach the invention substantially as claimed, the step of determining a telecommunication carrier for the group associated with the calling party (Col 46, ln 58-col 47, ln 43).

Claims 39 and 58-59 are rejected for the same reasons as recited in the rejection of claim 38.

Regarding claims 43 and 55, Fleischer, III et al differ from claimed invention in that it does not teach the step of providing a signal to a called party associated with the dialed number to indicate that an incoming call is associated with the group associated with the calling party.

However, London teaches a caller-id display unit at called party terminal displayed the number modified from caller identification number by privacy communication service system (Abstract and col 3, ln 8-42).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to integrate the Caller-ID service as taught by London into work-at-home system of Fleischer, III et al in order to provide called party the option of whether or not receiving the call based on the nature of information received.

Regarding claims 44-45, there is provided by Fleischer, III et al and London a system which comprises appropriate means for carrying out the method according to claim 27.

Claims 46-49 are rejected for the same reasons as recited in the rejection of claim 28.

Art Unit: 2642

3. Claims 36-37 and 56-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fleischer, III et al in view of London, and further in view of Bannister et al (US Pat No 5,548,636) that has been cited by Applicant.

Regarding claims 36 and 57, the integrated system of Fleischer, III et al and London teaches the invention substantially as claimed, with the exception of providing:

the dialed number comprises a private virtual network number.

However, Bannister et al teach:

the dialed number comprises a private virtual network number (col 6, ln 60-col 8, ln 41).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to add the dialed number comprising a private virtual network number as taught by Bannister et al to integration network of Fleischer, III et al and London to achieve Applicant's claimed limitations.

Regarding claims 37 and 56, the integrated system of Fleischer, III et al and London teaches the invention substantially as claimed, with the exception of providing:

the step of translating the dialed number to a called party identification number.

However, Bannister et al teach:

the step of translating the dialed number to a called party identification number (col 1, ln 21- ln 35 and col 6, ln 1- ln 59).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to add the step of translating the dialed number to a called party identification number as taught by Bannister et al to integrated system of Fleischer, III et al and London to achieve Applicant's claimed limitations.

Art Unit: 2642

Response to Arguments

4. Examiner provides no response to the Applicant Remarks since Applicant provides no argument pointing out disagreements with the examiner's contentions or to discuss the references applied against the claims, explaining how the claims avoid the references or distinguish from them.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bing Bui whose telephone number is (703) 308-5858. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 7:30 to 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ahmad Matar, can be reached on (703) 305-4731. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9314 and for formal communications intended for entry (please label the response "EXPEDITED PROCEDURE") or for informal or draft communications not intended for entry (please label the response "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT").

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

BING BUI
Apr 16, 2002



AHMAD MATAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600